THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) Judicial Reforms is a continuous process and is a combined responsibility of all stakeholders including the Executive and the Judiciary. Both the Union Government and the State Governments continue their efforts including through providing financial support for carrying out and sustaining judicial reforms. The expenditure incurred by the High Courts including that for disposal of cases being charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State Governments, the States also have a major responsibility in this regard. In so far as the Union Government is concerned it is continuing its efforts for judicial reforms including that by providing financial support to the State Governments by making budget provisions in this regard. Government approved a scheme for computerization of all District and subordinate courts of the country at a cost of Rs 442 crores. An amount of Rs.322.87 crore has been provided as Budger Estimates for 2007-08 for the Department of Justice for continuing both Plan and Non-Plan schemes aimed at efficient justice delivery. In addition to the Union Government's efforts, the States have also made appropriate provisions both for their respective High Courts and for its subordinate judiciary.

(b) and (c) The 120th Law Commission in its Report of July, 1987 had mentioned that there was a justification for increasing the then ratio of 10.5 judges per million population to at least 50 million Indian population. The Supreme Court, in its judgement of 21st March, 2002, in All India Judges Association & Ors. *Vs.* Union of India & Ors. (all State Governments and Union Territories are also party to this case), directed that an increase in the Judge strength from the existing 10.5 or 13 per 10 lakh people to 50 judges per 10 lakh people would be effected and implemented within a period of five years in a phased manner to be determined and directed by the Union Ministry of Law. The Central Government have filed an affidavit in the Supreme Court praying that the increase in judge strength in the Union Territories for which Central Government is administratively responsible be allowed based on workload and pendency of cases. The matter is *subjudice.*

Representation of women in Parliament

4182. SHRI RAMDAS AGARWAL : Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that India ranks very low at 108th position among 189 countries as regards the percentage of women law makers in

lower house of Parliament as per statistics released by Inter-Parliamentary Union;

(b) if so, the details thereof, country-wise;

(c) whether it is a fact that many countries have reserved seats for women even in their lower houses, and

(d) if so, the time frame within which Government will bring forward a suitable legislation to empower women by giving them more seats in Parliament?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) and (b) The Inter-Parliamentary Union is not an organization of Government of India and is also not based in India. The Government, therefore, cannot authenticate its data in the matter. However the web site of the organization reveals existence of such data and shows India at 110th place as on the 31st March, 2007. The country-wise details in this regard may be seen at website address *http://www.ipu.orgA/vmn-e/classif.htm.*

(c) The Government does not have authentic official data in this regard,which relate to other countries.

(d) Due to the lack of consensus among political parties on the issue of providing reservation for women in legislature in India, it is not
. possible to indicate any definite time frame.

Clearing of pending cases

4183. SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether with a view to clearing huge backlog of court cases, the Centre is considering to set up evening courts;

(b) if so, the details thereof and if not, reasons therefor;

(c) the measures proposed to be taken to clear the backlog of cases and speed up disposal of the cases;

(d) whether witnesses retracting their statements and turning hostile are some of the reasons for delay in disposal of the cases and poor rate of conviction even in heinous crimes; and